UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/451,160	11/30/1999	STEVEN R. BOAL	80.142-002	8692

7590   10/04/2006

RONALD P. KANANEN, ESQ.
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER P.L.L.C.
1233 20TH STREET N.W.
SUITE 501
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER
DURAN, ARTHUR D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3622	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/451,160	BOAL, STEVEN R.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Arthur Duran	3622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 August 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 22-50* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 22-50* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-18 and 22-50 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2.   The Amendment filed on 8/18/06 is sufficient to overcome the rejection. The same prior

art has been combined in a new manner to address the Applicant's claim amendments dated

8/18/2006 and the Applicant's new claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linden

(6,360,254) in view of Barnett (6,321,208).

Claims 24 and 25: Linden discloses associating a URL with a coupon, a promotional

code being appended to the URL; invoking use of the URL with a browser to thereby enable a

user to redeem the coupon; disabling future use of the invoked URL; and displaying coupons,

gift certificates, and other objects which can be selected (Figures 1, 2, 3a, 5, 8, 9, 10; and the

below citations):

"In a Web site system in which different private records or other resources are personal to

different users, a method is provided for allowing users to securely access a private resource

without the need to enter a username, password, or other authentication information, and

without the need to download special authentication software or data to the user's computer.

Each resource is assigned a private uniform resource locator (URL) which includes a fixed

character string and a unique token, and the URLs are conveyed by email (preferably using

hyperlinks) to users that are entitled to access such resources. The tokens are generated using a

method which distributes the tokens substantially randomly over the range of allowable token

values ("token space"). The token space is selected to be sufficiently large relative to the

expected number of valid tokens to inhibit the identification of valid tokens through trial and

error. When a user attempts to access a private URL (such as to access a private account

information page), a token validation program is used to determine whether the token is valid.

The method may be used to provide users secure to access private account information on the

Web site of merchant. Other practical applications include electronic gift certificate and

coupon redemption, gift registries, order confirmation electronic voting, and electronic greeting

cards (Abstract);

[Claim] 29. The computer system of claim 16, wherein the server system implements

an electronic coupon system in which the private URLs provide one-time-use discounts to

users.

Additionally, Linden further implies a coupon request(col 6, lines 14-22; claim 1).

Linden does not explicitly disclose a coupon request.

However, Barnettt discloses a coupon request (Figure 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Barnett's coupon request to Linden's coupon and promotion system. One would have been motivated to do this in order to better offer promotions capabilities to users for goods and services.

4.   Claims 1-18 and 22, 23 and 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linden (6,360,254) in view of Barnett (6,321,208) in view of Lang (2003/0083931).

Linden and Barnett disclose the features of claims 24 and 25.

Claims 1-3, 5-18 and 22, 23 are dependent upon claims 24 and 25.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 14-17:

Linden further discloses the user utilizing the Internet and accessing webpages, shopping, and receiving advertising (Fig. 5, 7, 9, 10).

Linden does not explicitly disclose targeting devices.

However, Lang discloses targeting devices.

In regards to claims 1-3, 5-8, 14-17, Lang discloses:

collecting device information from a client system, the device information being insufficient to specifically identify the user of the client system;

associating a device ID with the device information at a main server system, the device ID being insufficient to specifically identify the user;

selecting said coupon according to the device ID to thereby identify the coupon appropriate for said user based on the device information; and,

transmitting the selected coupon from the main server system to the client system (Fig 2; Fig. 3; Abstract; Paragraphs [9; 11; 14; 15; 17]).

Notice in the above citations from Lang that the electronic device and/or the user may be targeted and tracked. Hence, Lang discloses that the electronic device, without a specific identification of the user, can be tracked and targeted (see the above citations, particularly paragraph [17]).

Note in Paragraph [17] that Lang states that "In addition. . .the actual name may. . .may also be collected. . .". Also, notice in Lang that the information concerning user devices is available without intruding on the user.

Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that Lang's invention can be enacted without necessarily accessing the specifically user identifying information but rather based on the device information. One would be motivated to do this in order to target users based on the available information and without further intruding the users.

Also, while Lang discloses advertising targeted to user devices, Lang does not explicitly disclose coupons.

However, Lang discloses marketing, advertising, and promotions ([3]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that Lang's targeted marketing, advertising, and promotions can include coupons. One would have been motivated to do this in order to present marketing, advertising, and promotions that are in a form of possible interest to the user.

Also, in regards to claim 2, Lang discloses obtaining location related information ([17, 29]). Lang does not explicitly disclose utilizing postal or zip codes. However, Lang discloses determining location automatically, and also collecting information

In the above, Lang discloses that user devices can be targeted and that the user device can be useful for determining information that will be of more likely interest to the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Lang's targeting devices to Linden's user utilizing the Internet and accessing webpages, shopping, and receiving advertising. One would have been motivated to do this in order to better present offers of interest to the user.

Claim 4: Linden does not explicitly disclose printing the coupons. However, Barnett discloses uniquely identifying the coupons and printing the coupons (Fig. 1, 2, 3, 5; col 7, lines 20-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Barnett's printing coupons to Linden's providing coupons or Lang's providing advertisements. One would have been motivated to do this in order to better give the user a useful way to utilize the coupon/advertisement.

Claims 9 and 10: Lang discloses the above but neither of the references explicitly disclose that the graphical user interface on the client device uses icons which may also flash to indicate the availability of new coupons. However, Official Notice is again taken that the use of icons, graphics, colors, animation, etc. to attract the viewer's attention on graphical user interfaces is well known in the computer arts, and their use would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. In support of this Official

Notice, the Examiner previously provided excerpts from two HTML textbooks from 1996 to

show that, not only was it well known to "flash" parts of a web page to attract the user's

attention, but that the "Blink" command was also one of the standard commands in the

programming language (Graham, "The HTML Sourcebook, Second Edition, A Complete Guide

of HTML 3.0", 1996, pp 233-234)(Lemav, "Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 3.0 in a

Week", 1996, pp 183). Therefore, one would have been motivated to use icons, flashing or

otherwise, to notify the user of the Linden system in order to attract their attention more easily.

Claims 11-13, 18, 22, 23: Lang discloses the above, but neither reference explicitly

discloses that the coupon data is encrypted before it is sent to the client system nor that the client

system will also encrypt the coupon data upon receiving the data from the remote server.

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known within the computer and data encryption

arts to encrypt data being sent over unsecured networks using a plurality of encryption methods

in order to provide a higher level of security to the data. In support of this Official Notice the

Examiner previously provided Chapter 15 from a cryptography textbook from 1996 to show that

not only was double encryption a well known method to further protect data, but triple

encryption and other multiple encryption schemes were also well known and used in the art

(Schneier, "Applied Cryptography, Second Edition", 1996, pp 357-368). Therefore it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to encrypt

the coupon data in Lang, prior to transmitting the data over an unsecured network, such as the

Internet as disclosed by Lang, in order to prevent unauthorized interception of the data. It also

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to use a local encryption method to further encrypt and protect the encrypted data received

from the remote server. One would have been motivated to further encrypt the coupon data in

Linden, locally in this manner in order to prevent unauthorized disclosure of the selected

coupons to other persons who may use the client device (e.g. other family members, co-workers,

etc.).

Additionally, see the claim rejection for claims 47 and 48 below.

Claims 47, 48: Linden and Barnett disclose the above. Linden discloses utilizing

encryption (see Linden rejection). Linden does not explicitly disclose encryption of the coupon.

However, Barnett further discloses a coupon request, storing the coupon, and that the

coupon can be encrypted (Figure 1; Figure 5; col 11, lines 10-25). Barnett further discloses

identifying the user or user device and that this information can be placed on the coupon (col 11,

lines 3-7; col 11, lines 10-26). Barnett further discloses encryption transmittal of unique coupon

identifying information (col 13, lines 50-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made that coupon security/encryption can be utilized for coupon

communication. One would have been motivated to do this in order to better prevent fraud.

5.   Claims 26-46, 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Lang

(2003/0083931) in view of Barnett (6,321,208).

Claim 26, 28, 30-33, 39-42, 44, 45, 46:

Lang further discloses collecting device information from a client system, the device

information being insufficient to specifically identify the user of the client system;

associating a device ID with the device information at a main server system, the device

ID being insufficient to specifically identify the user;

selecting said coupon according to the device ID to thereby identify the coupon

appropriate for said user based on the device information; and,

transmitting the selected coupon from the main server system to the client system (Fig 2;

Fig. 3; Abstract; Paragraphs [9; 11; 14; 15; 17]).

Notice in the above citations from Lang that the electronic device and/or the user may be

targeted and tracked. Hence, Lang discloses that the electronic device, without a specific

identification of the user, can be tracked and targeted (see the above citations, particularly

paragraph [17]).

Note in Paragraph [17] that Lang states that "In addition. . .the actual name may. . .may

also be collected. . .". Also, notice in Lang that the information concerning user devices is

available without intruding on the user.

Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that Lang's invention can be

enacted without necessarily accessing the specifically user identifying information but rather

based on the device information. One would be motivated to do this in order to target users

based on the available information and without further intruding the users.

Also, while Lang discloses advertising targeted to user devices, Lang does not explicitly

disclose coupons or a coupon request.

However, Lang discloses marketing, advertising, and promotions ([3]). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made that Lang's targeted marketing, advertising, and promotions can include coupons. One

would have been motivated to do this in order to present marketing, advertising, and promotions

that are in a form of possible interest to the user.

Additionally, Lang discloses marketing and advertising, promoting goods and services,

targeting a group of consumers ([3]), improving the cost effectiveness of advertising ([5]),

targeting users and tracking purchases ([6, 7]). Lang further discloses selling and purchasing

([29, 31]). Hence, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that Lang can send a coupon to a

user as way to do all of the above.

However, Barnettt discloses a coupon request (Figure 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to add Barnett's coupon request to Lang's and targeted promotions and

purchasing/selling inciting. One would have been motivated to do this in order to better offer

promotions capabilities to users for goods and services or to better promote purchasing/selling.

Claim 27: In regards to claim 27, Lang discloses obtaining location related information

([17, 29]). Lang does not explicitly disclose utilizing postal or zip codes. However, Lang

discloses determining location automatically, and also collecting information

Claims 34, 35: Lang discloses the above but neither of the references explicitly disclose

that the graphical user interface on the client device uses icons which may also flash to indicate

the availability of new coupons. However, Official Notice is again taken that the use of icons,

graphics, colors, animation, etc. to attract the viewer's attention on graphical user interfaces is

well known in the computer arts, and their use would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made. In support of this Official Notice, the

Examiner previously provided excerpts from two HTML textbooks from 1996 to show that, not

only was it well known to "flash" parts of a web page to attract the user's attention, but that the

"Blink" command was also one of the standard commands in the programming language

(Graham, "The HTML Sourcebook, Second Edition, A Complete Guide of HTML 3.0", 1996, pp

233-234)(Lemav, "Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 3.0 in a Week", 1996, pp 183).

Therefore, one would have been motivated to use icons, flashing or otherwise, to notify the user

of the Lang system in order to attract their attention more easily.

Claims 36, 37, 38, 43: Lang discloses the above, Lang does not explicitly discloses that

the coupon data is encrypted before it is sent to the client system nor that the client system will

also encrypt the coupon data upon receiving the data from the remote server. Official Notice is

taken that it is old and well known within the computer and data encryption arts to encrypt data

being sent over unsecured networks using a plurality of encryption methods in order to provide a

higher level of security to the data. In support of this Official Notice the Examiner previously

provided Chapter 15 from a cryptography textbook from 1996 to show that not only was double

encryption a well known method to further protect data, but triple encryption and other multiple

encryption schemes were also well known and used in the art (Schneier, "Applied Cryptography,

Second Edition", 1996, pp 357-368). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to encrypt the coupon data in Lang,

prior to transmitting the data over an unsecured network, such as the Internet as disclosed by

Lang, in order to prevent unauthorized interception of the data. It also would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a local

encryption method to further encrypt and protect the encrypted data received from the remote

server. One would have been motivated to further encrypt the coupon data in Lang, locally in this

manner in order to prevent unauthorized disclosure of the selected coupons to other persons who may use the client device (e.g. other family members, co-workers, etc.).

Additonally, see the claim rejection for claims 49 and 50 below.

Claim 29: Lang does not explicitly disclose printing the coupons. However, Barnett discloses uniquely identifying the coupons and printing the coupons (Fig. 1, 2, 3, 5; col 7, lines 20-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Barnett's printing coupons to Lang's providing advertisements. One would have been motivated to do this in order to better give the user a useful way to utilize the coupon/advertisement.

Claims 49, 50: Lang and Barnett disclose the above. Lang does not explicitly disclose encryption of the coupon.

However, Barnett further discloses a coupon request, storing the coupon, and that the coupon can be encrypted (Figure 1; Figure 5; col 11, lines 10-25). Barnett further discloses identifying the user or user device and that this information can be placed on the coupon (col 11, lines 3-7; col 11, lines 10-26). Barnett further discloses encryption transmittal of unique coupon identifying information (col 13, lines 50-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that coupon security/encryption can be utilized for coupon communication. One would have been motivated to do this in order to better prevent fraud.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18, 22-50 have been considered but are

not found persuasive. The same prior art has been combined in a new manner to address the

Applicant's claim amendments dated 8/18/2006 and the Applicant's new claims. Please see the

rejections above. Also, note the additional comments below.

On page 17 of the Applicant's Remarks dated 8/18/2006, Applicant states, "As addressed

above, Linden fails to teach a promotional code contained in a URL associated with a coupon.

Lang fails to remedy this deficiency. As discussed above, Lang does not contain the word

"promotional" at all, and a computerized search reveals that Lang does not contain the word

"URL'" either. Additionally, as addressed above, Lang fails to teach "device information being

insufficient to specifically identify the user." Linden fails to remedy this deficiency. Indeed,

Linden teaches that a "user's e-mail address and a time stamp" should be encoded into the token,

and then the token should be embedded into a URL."

However, Examiner notes that it is the Applicant's claims as stated in the Applicant's

claims that are being rejected with the prior art. Also, although the claims are interpreted in light

of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van

Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). And, Examiner notes that claims are

given their broadest reasonable construction. See *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 54 USPQ2d 1664

(Fed. Cir. 2000).

And, Applicant's claims state minimal specific features as to the characteristics of the

promotional code contained in the URL. Hence, the promotional code in the URL is open to a

broad interpretation.

And, Linden discloses a promotional code contained in a URL associated with a coupon

(Linden, rejection above; and Figure 3a; Figure 9, item 74; and claim 29). Note in these figures

and citations that the specific promotional code that identifies the specific promotion or specific

coupon/promotion amount is included in the URL. The URL can be clicked on to uniquely go to

and uniquely identify a specific coupon/promotion. The promotional URL in Linden is matched

against the list of possible promotions/coupons to ensure that the coded URL is a valid

promotion/coupon. Hence, Linden discloses a URL associated with a coupon and that the URL

utilizes a promotional code.

Also, Lang discloses device information being insufficient to specifically identify the

user (Lang, rejection above; also, Paragraphs [11, 17]; also, Abstract).

Note in these citations that Lang repeatedly states that the electronic device OR the user

can be tracked, that the location of the electronic device OR the user can be tracked and that the

actual name of the user MAY be used.

Examiner notes that teaching of a preference or several options does not constitute a

teaching away from the proposed combination under review. See In re Fulton, 391 F.3d 1195,

1199-1200, 73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

Also, notice the Abstract in Lang:

"A method of advertising to mobile users of an electronic device linked to a
wide area network. The method enables advertisers to more effectively target
their advertisements to mobile users using a user file that includes their
electronic device ID information, their past, current network connection
activity, and the past, current or anticipated physical locations. The method
includes the first step of obtaining the device's ID information when connected
to the wide area network. Next, information regarding the network connection
activity of the electronic device or the user over the wide area network is
obtained. Next, the past, current or anticipated physical locations of the
electronic device when connected to the wide area network is determined. . ." (Lang, Abstract).

Notice in the Abstract that the information of the electronic device is necessarily obtained

and tracked. And, that the user name or personal information is additional or optional

information that can be tracked. And, in Lang, the device is tracked and then information about

a user is inferred based upon the activity of the device. Or, the device and the user may each be

explicitly tracked. Still, Lang discloses that just the device is tracked such that the user

information can be inferred, however, the actual user is not necessarily known.

Also, notice in independent claim 1 (Lang, claim 1) that no personal or personally

identify information of a user is collected. It is not until dependent claim 8 (Lang, claim 8) that

personally identifying user information is collected. Hence, Lang discloses several version of his

invention. In one version, Lang discloses that device information is collected. In another

version, Lang discloses that device information is collected and user personal or specific user

identifying information is collected.

Hence, Lang discloses device information being insufficient to specifically identify the

user.

Also, in regards to the obviousness of coupons, Lang discloses marketing and

advertising, promoting goods and services, targeting a group of consumers ([3]), improving the

cost effectiveness of advertising ([5]), targeting users and tracking purchases ([6, 7]). Lang

further discloses selling and purchasing ([29, 31]).

Hence, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that Lang can send a coupon to a user

as way to do all of the above.

Examiner notes that it must be presumed that the artisan knows something about the art

apart from what the references disclose. In re Jacobv, 309 F.2d 513, 135 USPQ 317 (CCPA

1962). The problem cannot be approached on the basis that artisans would only know what they

read in references; such artisans must be presumed to know something about the art apart from

what the references disclose. In re Jacoby. Also, the conclusion of obviousness may be made

from common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any

specific hint of suggestion a particular reference. In re Bozek, 416 F.2d 1385, USPQ 545 (CCPA

1969). And, every reference relies to some extent on knowledge or persons skilled in the art to

complement that which is disclosed therein. In re Bode, 550 F.2d 656, USPQ 12 (CCPA 1977).

Also, because of the claim amendments, Lang or Linden and Barnett are now combined.

And, Linden and Barnett explicitly discloses coupons.

Also, in regards to encryption, please see the rejection above utilizing the Barnett

reference.

Examiner notes that while specific references were made to the prior art, it is actually

also the prior art in its entirety and the combination of the prior art in its entirety that is being

referred to. Also, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where

the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure:

a) Woolston (20050262005) discloses URLs associated with coupons:

"[0054] The instance of the dynamic stream, the navlet of bid/ask information,

may be further propagated or populated with electronic coupons 610 or

advertisements, not shown. The electronic coupon 610 may provide a URL link

and access code information to unlock or decode electronic coupon information

to provide support for discount or loyalty program participation. In one mode

of the system the navlet or dynamic bid/ask pricing streaming display may be

vertically scaled to support one-half sized Internet advertising placards. In

another mode of the system, the navlet may detect the horizontal size of the

display on which it appears to horizontally scale the size of the navlet. The

system, as discussed further below, may distribute Internet advertising and

coupons based on taxonomic, user profile information, or other routable and

distribution schemes provided by the system."

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Arthur Duran whose telephone number is (571) 272-6718. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri, 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Arthur Duran
Primary Examiner
9/19/2006